Ameritech with information on NXX issues to begin root cause analysis of the situation and the steps necessary to correct any problem. A copy of the information faxed by MFS on January 27, 1997 is attached. Ameritech Michigan is investigating based on this information. Ameritech Michigan believes some of the problems described by MFS are a result of MFS' unilateral decision to move a prefix code (NXX) to different locations in Illinois.

4. "Reciprocal Compensation"

The situation described by MFS does not in any way involve a "unilateral change" in the economics of doing business in Michigan; this is a blatant red herring. On September 12, 1996, the Commission issued an order in Case No. U-10860, which stated in relevant part:

"Finally, until local call termination charges are implemented for all local traffic [specifically, EAS traffic from independent LECs], no such charges shall be made to competing providers. In that manner, the nondiscriminatory requirements may be given effect."

Based on its understanding of that order, Ameritech Michigan sent a letter to MFS and other carriers initiating an interim suspension of reciprocal compensation arrangements. As acknowledged by MFS, after subsequent discussions between the parties and clarification from the Commission, within approximately 11 days, Ameritech Michigan advised MFS that, as requested by MFS, Ameritech Michigan would not suspend reciprocal compensation arrangements between the parties. No suspension was ever initiated, and there was never any impact on MFS' economics of doing business in Michigan.

5. "Fiber Splice"

Initially, it should be noted that the collocation points referenced by MFS were ordered in October 1994. MFS had not proceeded with their fiber cable placement until July 1996 to complete these collocation sites.

At the Troy-Somerset location, MFS did not have their fiber cable to the specified meet manhole at the time MFS contacted Ameritech in July 1996. Ameritech Michigan could not proceed until MFS had completed this work. This partially contributed to the delays and subsequent rescheduling. Ameritech's records indicate that on August 7, 1996, MFS was ready for the splicing to occur. The splicing was completed on August 31, 1996.

At the Troy-Main location, Ameritech completed the requested work on August 21, 1996. This site required additional central office work to meet MFS' requested riser cable requirements. Furthermore, Ameritech spent 1.5 days troubleshooting the fiber splice at MFS' insistence that Ameritech had improperly spliced the cables. The Ameritech technician subsequently determined that MFS' fiber cable was "open" at splice locations within MFS' own cable. Thus, MFS' own network problems contributed to delays in providing service at Troy-Main.

6. "Ameritech's Term Products"

MFS' contention on this issue is somewhat confusing. Ameritech does provide volume and term discounts to retail customers, and those volume and term discounts are available to resellers at a wholesale discount. It appears MFS is suggesting that it should be entitled to obtain volume and term discounts without making any volume and term commitment, apparently because such a commitment would be inconsistent with MFS' marketing strategy. Such an absurd interpretation is not mandated by any law or Commission requirement.

MFS also appears to be contesting the Commission's prior

determination rejecting the demand for a "fresh look;" i.e., an abrogation of existing

valid contracts between Ameritech Michigan and its customers. Once again, the

Commission already addressed that issue clearly and succinctly when it rejected

such a proposal in Case No. U-10647. See Ameritech Michigan's response to Brooks

Fiber, January 15, 1997, p. 5.

CONCLUSION

Significantly, MFS has not identified any instance where Ameritech

Michigan is not offering the interconnection services and unbundled network

elements mandated by the competitive checklist in the federal Act. To the extent

that MFS has identified operational issues, Ameritech Michigan will continue to

work with MFS to address concerns through the business relationship between the

parties and, if necessary, the dispute resolution procedures in the interconnection

agreement between the parties as approved by the Commission.

Respectfully submitted,

AMERITECH MICHIGAN

CRAIGA. ANDERSON (P28968)

444 Michigan Avenue, Room 1750

Detroit, Michigan 48226

(313) 223-8033

DATED: January 31, 1997

- 11 -

MFS Now Offering Local Telephone Services Over Its Own Fiber Network In Detroit

DETROIT. May 29 / PRNewswire / -- MFS Communications Company, Inc. (MFS) announced-today that It is now offering a full range of local, facilities-based telephone services over its 103-route-mite. fiber-optic network in the greater Detroit metropolitan area.

"We're committed to delivering personalized customer service and tailored communications solutions, supported by our reliable state-of-the-art network facilities, to Detroit-area businesses of all sizes," said Ronald Beaumont, president and CEO of MFS North America. "Our customers rely on us to be the single point-of-contact for their relecommunications needs. This gives them the freedom to focus on what they do best -- growing their businesses."

MFS Intelenet, a unit of MFS, has been providing resale-type local telephone services to over 1,000 customers in Detroit since 1991, and greatly expands its presence in the greater metropolitan Detroit area, with this end-to-end service offering over MFS' network:

MFS Intelenet offers one-stop shopping for communications services to medium and small businesses. It provides local telephone service, domestic and international long-distance service and % variety of enhanced services -- voice mail. calling card, 800/868 number services, customized billing and management reports.

Since September 1995, MPS Telecom, another operating unit of MFS, has been serving large business and government customers in Detroit by providing critical fiber links directly from a customer's location to long-distance carriers or to other customer locations. MFS Telecom is now also offering its customers local telephone services over MFS' fiber-optic network.

Last week. MFS and Ameritech signed a landmark interconnection agreement that covers Ameritech's five-state region, including Michigan. This is the first agreement between a Regional Fell Operating Company and a facilities-based competitor, which seeks to setisfy specific requirements of the Telecommunications act of 1996.



MFS is a leading provider or communication services for business and government. Through its operating subsidiaries, MFS provides one-stop shopping for integrated local and long-distance services and wide range of high-quality voice, data and other summer services and systems specifically designed to meet the requirement of customers and government customers. MFS' common stock is traded on Nasday Unider the symbol MFST. MFS is headquartered in Omaha, Nebraska, Tolling the

/CONTACT: Josh Howell or Claire Dunnett, 708-218-7332, or Investor Relations, Gary Brandt, 402-231-3432, all of MFS/ 14:52 EDT

0233 05/29/96 14:52 EDT :TICKER: MFST KPS.XX :SUBJECT: CNGL TLCM NPRD MI NE

Copyright (c) 1996 PR Newswire Received by NewsEDGE/LAN: 5/29/96 2:23 PM

W TRLD COM

I TOWER LANE, SUITE 1600, OAKBROOK TERRACE, IL 60(1): Phone: 630/203-7200
Fai: 630/203-9969



Daic/127 197			
Number of Pages (including cover):			
TO:	be Morgan		
COMPANY:	Amertech		
NUMBER:	3/2-335- 2927		
· Commence of the second			
PROM: Kichelle Vieter			
FAX NUMBER:	630/203-0569		
PHONE NUMBER	630-203-7020		
COMMENTS:	Please call if you don't receive all pages.		
Pease C	ell me once you've		
lease call me once you've ecewid this Information Thanks ye! Phills			
Shanks	me! Reliebe		

Consolidated List of Customers with MFS NXX Issues

Calling from:

708 424-XXXX (Evergreen Park)

Calling to:

708-918-XXXX (Hamewood)

Comments:

Told this was a Toli call

Calling from:

630-262-XXXX (Geneva)

Calling to:

630-991-XXXX (Geneva)

Comments: Told by American Operators that their new MPS exettanges were considered tell (Area B)

phone sails.

Calling from:

313-284-2141

Calling to:

313-674-0586

Comments: The following information was told to the customer..."The numbers are so new that

information operators may not have them in their data trast... ""No such exchange in the 313 area. (629)

Not in the Ameritash date have."

Studio Chy, CA Colle

Sourio City, CA (\$18-980-XXXX)

Calls to: 818-742-0501

Commente: Calls cannot be completed ...

Calls to: \$18-638-0501

Commeges: Call works to Glendala

El Segundo, CA

El Segundo, CA (310-726)

Calls to: 310-953-0501 -

Comments: Fest Busy

Calls to: 310-765-0501

Comments: Can't be completed as dialed

Passaort Users:

Calling from: \$16-642-XXXX

Calling to: #10-365-XXXX

Community: Resciving the LD error massage, "You must first diel a one"

Calling from R10-775

Calling to: 810-819

Date: January 27, 1997

Comments: Treated at toll Calls

Calling from: 313-729-8461
Calling on: 313-749-6040
Comments: They dial 7 digits and receiving call that they cannot be completed as dialoc.

Date: January 27, 1997 Page 2

444 Michigan Avenue Room 1750 Detroit. MI 48226 Office: 313-223-8033 Fax: 313-496-9326

Craig A. Anderson Counsel



January 31, 1997

Ms. Dorothy Wideman Executive Secretary Michigan Public Service Commission P.O. Box 30221 Lansing, MI 48909

Re: MPSC Case No. U-11104.

Dear Ms. Wideman:

MOREONIA COMOS

JAN 81 1897

COMMISSION

Enclosed for filing in the above-referenced case is an original and fifteen copies of the Ameritech Michigan's Third Supplemental Information Filing.

Very truly yours,

Craigh Anderson (ls)

Enclosure

cc: All Parties of Record

CAA:jkt

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, to consider Ameritech Michigan's compliance competitive checklist in Section 271 confidence communications Act of 1996.

Case No. U-11104

AMERITECH MICHIGAN'S THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FILING

Ameritech Michigan submits the following additional information in this proceeding:

Letters and statements (in addition to those filed on January 24, 1997 in Ameritech Michigan's second supplemental information filing) sent to the FCC in connection with Ameritech Michigan's application pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to provide in-region, interLATA services in Michigan.

A list of such letters and statements is listed on Exhibit A-1 attached hereto. Copies of such letters and statements are also attached.

Respectfully submitted,

AMERITECH MICHIGAN

CRAIG A ANDERSON (P28968)

444 Michigan Avenue, Room 1750

Detroit, Michigan 48226

(313) 223-8033

Dated: January 31, 1997

Exhibit A-1 to Ameritech Michigan's Third Supplemental Filing in Case U-11104

	Last Name	First Name
1	Bennett	Loren N.
2	Bercaw	Allan M.
3	Brackenridge	Robert L.
4	Cherry, Jr.	John D.
	Cockrel, Jr.	Kenneth V.
	Crumb	Robert T.
7	Ellis	Arthur E.
	Fitzgerald	Frank M.
	Fly	Daniel J.
	Griffin	Michael J.
11	Hertel	Curtis
12	Hodge	Doris J.
	Ikola	Kay L.
14	Krueger	Richard
	London	Terry
16	McNamara	Edward H.
	Olshove	Dennis
	Quaries	Nancy L.
	Rivas, Jr.	Armando
	Sewell	Jon
	Thornton	Robert
22	Wells	Steven W.



THE SERATE STATE OF MICHIGAN

LOREN N. BENNETT

OTH GETTLET

THE GOT STEEL

LANSING MICHIGAN 6866-7856

PROPERTY STRUMBER

TOO 6171 STRUMB

JECKNETY 14, 1997

MEMORY FOOTH FASTIN WE SELECTED TO SELECTE

The Honorable Reed Hundt, Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 'M' Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20544

Dear Mr. Hundt

I am writing you in support of Americach's efforts to smort the long distance market within Michigan. On Jamury 2, 1997, Americach filed a position with the Federal Communications Commission seeking permission to enter the long distance market under Section 271 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, for the purpose of providing invegion long distance telecommunication services in Michigan.

By allowing Ameritech to enter this market, I believe we will be moving in an appropriate direction, that of true competition in the local and long distance markets. Over the last half dozen years, the cost to consumers for basic long distance services offered by the major long distance providers has continued to rise, while the industry average for local access charges has steadily dropped. It is also worth noting that during the same time frame, Ameritech's local access charges have remained considerably below the industry average. With the major long distance companies now entering the local market, it would only soom fair to allow a Regional Bell Operating Company the opportunity to provide long distance service.

With consumers demanding more choices, expanded services and better customer service, the logical decision of providing more options in the marketplace seems appropriate. Providing more competition and customer choices will ensure that Michigan remains competitive with the test of the nation in state of the art telecommunications products and services.

In summery, I would like to arge the Federal Communications Commission to allow Ameritech to enter the long distance market in Michigan for the reasons described above. Thank you for your time and consideration in addressing this very important issue.

Sincerely,

Loren N. Bermstr State Senetor

Michigan Senete

C. Mr Donald J. Russell, U.S. Department of Justice

Bren N. Brust

LNB:H



January 17, 1997

The Honorable Reed Hunt, Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20554

WARREN CAMPUS

Dear Mr. Hundt,

27500 Dequindre Rd. Warren, MI 48002

810/558-8700

NORTH BLDG. FAX 810/558-4697

SOUTH BLDC.

I am writing you to express my support for the Ameritech Section 271 filing to provide long distance service in Michigan.

As the Computer Information Systems Curriculum Coordinator for the Detroit College of Business in Warren, Michigan, I am very interested in the current and future state of the communications industry. In a global economy, schools and universities have an increasingly important stake in the availability of and access to competitively priced, innovative services. Access to such services provides today's instructors with a vital set of new tools with which to expand the world of information for our students.

Of particular significance today are the various distance learning technologies. Through these applications, students have access to research, information and other students from around the state and world. At a time when other communications companies which bundle local and long distance services are entering the marketplace in Michigan, I am concerned to note that Ameritech is unable to provide long distance services. From my experience, Ameritech has done more for education in this state than any other communications company. Yet, at a time when distance learning applications are increasingly important to the educational community, Ameritech is unable to provide the needed long distance services which support many distance learning applications.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. Your support for Ameritech's filing would go a long way toward expanding the service options which are of growing importance to the educational community.

Sincerely.

MAIN CAMPUS 313/581-4400/ FAX 313/581-682

Alian M. Bercaw

FUNT CAMPUS 810/789-2200 FAX 810/789-2266

AACE
ABULT AGE LEATED
CAME EDUCATION
313/562-8600
FAX 313/562-8819

cc. Mr. Donald J. Russell, DOJ
The U.S. Department of Justice
Telecommunications Task Force Anti-Trust Division
8205 555 4th Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20001



NOTE SETTLE THE PROPERTY OF TH

Mouse of Representatives State of Michigan

COMMITTEES: LOCAL GOVERNMENT, CHAR TAIL POLICY TOURISM AND RECREATION

The Honorable Reed Hundt, Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20544

Dear Chairman Hundt:

As a State Representative from a Michigan border county, the residents in my district are exposed daily to competition from the nearby states of Indiana and Illinois. Competition for their banking, their shopping, and the companies for which they work. Michigan prides itself on creating policies which foster a competitive atmosphere and I am honored to be a member of the legislative body responsible for shaping these policies.

With that in mind, I would like to express my support for Ameritech Michigan's application to enter the long-distance market. Competition has proven to be the cornerstone of our economy, leading to greater consumer choice, lower prices, and higher quality of service. Allowing another contender into the long-distance telephone market can only help the industry to continue bettering itself and provide consumers with the lowest cost possible for this service.

I would urge your thoughtful consideration of the Ameritech Michigan application for long-distance market entry. We count upon the PCC's thorough review of this application as an indicator not only of an expanding long-distance market, but also as a sign that competition within the local telephone service industry in Michigan exists and will continue to grow with the same success for the industry and the consumer that has occurred elsewhere within the telecommunication industry.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If I, or my colleagues in the Michigan House of Representatives, can be of any future assistance on this issue, please do not hesitate to contact my office.

Sincerely,

Representative Bob Brackenridge

State Representative

79th District





SENATE STATE OF MICHIGAN

JOHN D. CHERRY, JR. SENATE MINORITY LEADER

CAPITOL BUILDING

January 28, 1997

The Honorable Reed Hundt, Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street NW Washington, DC 20544

Dear Mr. Hundt:

As Michigan's Senate Minority Leader, I enthusiastically support Ameritech's Section 271 filing to provide in-region long distance service in Michigan. Once approved, Michigan will finally have competition in the long distance market, added choice, and enhanced customer service as envisioned by both the Michigan and the Federal Telecommunications Acts.

Currently, there are 14 companies such as AT&T, MCI-Metro, and Brooks Fiber, etc., that have been licensed to provide local service in Michigan. Ameritech has fulfilled its 14 point interLATA "checklist" and therefore should be allowed to provide long distance service as well.

Michigan has always been at the forefront with its state-of-the-art communications technology. By granting Ameritech's 271 application, it will continue to create new and improved services enabling Michigan to continue to attract and retain business and satisfy its current customers' needs.

Once again, I offer my heartfelt support to Ameritech's Section 271 filing and strongly urge your thoughtful consideration of their request.

John D. Cherry, Jr. Senate Minority Leader

JDC/dk





Bayne County Commission

KENNETH V. COCKREL, JR. COMMERCIONER DISTRICT S

CHAIR: YOUTH AT RIGH YARK PORCE FUBLIC EAPETY & JUDICIARY

VICE CHAIR: COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC SEVELOPUDIT

WEMBER: COMMITTED OF THE WHILE VETERANT AFFAIRS WAYE AND MILANS MEALTH AND MIRAN REPROCESS WHYNE COUNTY BUILDING 900 AMOGLAN, SUITE 4M DETROIT, MENARAH ASSM

> FIR 124-0079 FAN (010) 224-0109

January 24, 1997

The Honorable Reed Hundt, Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20544

Dear Chairman Hundt:

On January 2, 1997, Ameritech Corporation officially requested permission to provide long distance service to its residential customers. The addition of Ameritech to the current list of long distance carriers would be a positive move that should result in consumers receiving quality service and competitive rates.

I strongly support this measure and hope you will to. Again, I believe it would be something of benefit for Michigan residents. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kenneth V. Cockel, Jr. Kenneth V. Cockeel, Jr.

Wayne County Commissioner

District 5

oc: Donald J. Russell

Telecommunications Task Force



January 16, 1997

The Honorable Reed Hundt, Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 M. Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20544

Dear Mr. Hundt:

The Rural Emergency Medical Education Consortium (REMEC) was established in 1993 as a non-profit consortium made up of eleven hospitals in northern Michigan. Our main objective is to use telecommunications technology to link twenty counties in northern lower Michigan providing emergency and health related education via interactive video.

REMEC supports Ameritech's filing under Section 271 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 to provide in-region long distance service in Michigan. We urge the FCC to act on the approval of Ameritech's application. We believe this would allow them to directly respond to requests from customers like REMEC for added choices of expanded and innovative services. REMEC members would benefit from the increased competition through service and pricing.

Respectfully.

Robert T. Crumb

REMEC Chairperson of the Board

Healthshare Group/Northern Michigan Hospital

cc: Mr. Donald J. Russel

Telecommunications Task Force, Anti-Trust Division

The U.S. Department of Justice 8205 - 555 4th Street N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20001

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

ATMAN I BLIS

STATE OF MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

P.O. Box 30008 Lansing, Michigan 48909

January 30, 1997

Darety Berdman Clark Dares Barkers Faberts Marris Markers Vand McColer Vachers B. Mayor Kathan M. Stree Shares A. Wise Clark J. Western

DOVERNOR FORM ENGLER

The Honorable Reed Hundt, Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20544

Dear Chairman Hundt:

As the State Superintendent of Education for the State of Michigan and former Director of the Michigan Department of Commerce, I have been watching the telecommunications industry closely. This industry has a substantial impact on our educational community as well as on our state's commerce, and this role is growing by leaps and bounds.

In 1995, the Michigan Legislature passed the Michigan Telecommunications Act and the Governor signed it into law. This statute enables telecommunications competition in the Michigan marketplace. As a result of this progressive legislation, the Michigan Public Service Commission has granted 14 competitive local licenses to telecommunications companies. Allowing Ameritech to enter the long distance market is consistent with the efforts made in Michigan over the last six years. Increased competition in the local and long distance markets will bring expanded services, and it is time to move forward and enable competition to work.

I am convinced that Ameritech has met all of the legal and regulatory requirements set forth by the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 and I urge you to approve Ameritech's application. Your positive action will bring benefits to all citizens of Michigan from our classrooms to our boardrooms.

Sincerely,

Arthur E. Ellis

cc:

Donald J. Russell

United States Department of Justice



FRANK M. FITZGERALD

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES P.O. BOX 30014 LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909-7514 (\$17) 373-0853 SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE STATE REPRESENTATIVE 71ST DISTRICT EATON COUNTY MEMBER OF COMMITTEES ON: OVERSIGHT AND ETHICS. CHAIR JUDICIARY AND CIVIL RIGHTS INSURANCE

January 24, 1997

The Honorable Reed Hundt, Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street NW Washington, DC 20544

Dear Mr. Hundt:

I write to support Ameritech's application to offer long distance service to its customers in the state of Michigan.

The Michigan legislature has passed and since reauthorized telecommunications reform under Michigan law. A hallmark of our statute is a belief that competition should occur in the provision of local telephone service. I believe that the constituents whom I represent are best served by having as many options as possible, not only for local service, but also for long distance service. Many providers makes for lower rates and better service for everyone.

I trust that Ameritech's application will receive every consideration by the Federal Communications Commission. Should it meet the criteria which the commission members have established for approval, I hope that your action will be quick and favorable.

Yery truly yours

FRANK M. FITZGERALD

FMF:sls

cc: Mr. Donald J. Russell, U.S. Department of Justice Telecommunications Task Force



45 July 1



January 16, 1997

The Honorable Reed Hundt, Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 M. Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20544

Dear Mr. Hundt:

This letter is in support of Ameritech's filing under Section 271 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 to provide in-region long distance service in Michigan. We would request the FCC act swiftly to approve Ameritech's application.

The Rural Emergency Medical Education Consortium (REMEC) was established to provide a distance learning network for twenty counties in Northern Michigan. REMEC, a non-profit consortium, has membership of eleven hospitals. REMEC's mission is to enhance the delivery of emergency medical and health related education in rural northern Michigan through telecommunication network technology.

REMEC membership feels the approval of Ameritech's filing would increase competition in local and long distance services in Michigan. A great part of our annual budget is in the telecommunication expense area and with increased competition we would hope to see more aggressive pricing to customers.

Respectfully.

Daniel J. Fly REMEC Director

cc: Mr. Donald J. Russel

Telecommunications Task Force, Anti-Trust Division

The U.S. Department of Justice 8205 - 555 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001



Mouse of Representatives State of Michigan

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAEL J. GRIFFIN 64TH DISTRICT—JACKSON STATE CAPITOL BUILDING
PO BOX 30014
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48808-7514
PHONE ANEA 517—373-1785

January 23, 1997

The Honorable Reed Hundt, Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 M. Street N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20544

Dear Mr. Hundt:

As a state representative who has served on the House Telecommunications Committee, I support Ameritech's filing to provide in-region long distance service in Michigan. I have served in the Michigan Legislature for over 24 years, and during that time have found Ameritech to be a company of high integrity and a provider of quality service to the citizens of Michigan.

Combining the benefits of the Michigan Telecommunications Act and the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 has created an environment in Michigan for competition to flourish. By approving Ameritech's application you will allow our citizens to continue to have greater choices and take advantage of the new products and services that are emerging from this exciting industry.

I urge your thoughtful consideration of Ameritech's request.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. GRIFFIN State Representative 64th District-Jackson



SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

Curtis Hertel

The Honorable Reed Hundt, Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Washington, DC 20544

Michigan House of Representatives
State Capital Building
Lauring, Michigan 48913
Phone: (\$17) 373-1983

January 19, 1997

Dear Honorable Hundt:

This letter is being written in support of Ameritech's filling under Seutiun 271 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 to provide in-region long distance service in Michigan. By allowing Ameritech to enter the long distance market, an increase in competition for both local and long distance services within the state would result, providing better and expanded customer services and greater choice to the residents of Michigan

It is this competition that will ensure the quality, state-of-the-art communications infrastructure that is needed for a string, growing economy. The only way to continue meeting the increased needs of consumers wold be to grant approval of Ameritech's petition under Section 271.

Ameritech has proven to be an asset to the state of Michigan in a number of ways. They have over 30,000 current and retired employees within the state. The number will surely continue to grow once the application has been approved, providing much needed jobs to be residents of my state. Ameritech has currently and consistently met all of the legal and technical requirements and regulations thus far put forward by both the Federal and Michigan Telecommunications Act.

These few reasons alone warrant enough cause to justify why Ameritech's petition should be approved, so it is here once again. That I ask for serious consideration to be given to Ameritech's request to begin providing in-region long distance service to the state of Michigan.

Thank you for your sincere attention to this issue. I will be available to discuss in detail an aspect of this letter should you desire. I look forward to hearing your decision.

Sincerely.

Speaker Curtis Hertel

Michigan House of Representatives

CC:

Mr. Donald J. Russell



-



ECCUTIVE BOARD OFFICERS President

President Block

Retenting Socretary Codemics Only

Treatmer William M. Sharbater

Chaliparana, Secol of Directors House L. Chie

Datiness Manager Datin J. Hodge

Member at Large Arthur Olyan

REPRESENTATIVES

Higher Education

High Schools Assessing Hugher

House Schools
Houseon Strings

Demony Schools Yvene: Walker

Tenthers Letrage Richardson

General Services Present Dolors

Public Relations
Andrew Marie

Finance Second Control

Program

Continues

Legislavion/Political Action Johns Prempets Municipality Real Premis

Parliamentum Tommet L. Buren

Patt President Edwin Rabinson

PAST PRESIDENTS
Prof Marin
Eneral Creety
Alpa Greet
Pany Williams
David Mandows
Halan Clemesy
Tomain L. Boron

AST CHAIRPERSON
DARD OF DIRECTORS
James Woodrelf
Chushus Johnson
Waldo Smrth
Almo Greer
Purry Willasses
James Co-ma
Joel Hardertt
Barbons L. Dant
Barty Davis
Jodquelant B. Miller
Deright Lerves
Story Bernes
Berney Davis

Metropolitan Detroit Alliance of Black School Educators

Fost Office Box 02339 . North End Station . Detroit, Michigan 48202

January 20, 1997

The Honorable Reed Hundt, Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20544

Dear Mr. Hundt:

This letter is designed to convey my support for approval of Ameritech's application to offer in-region long distance service in the state of Michigan in accordance to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. It is my understanding that this will mark the first time a local service provider has opened up its network and met the requirements for full competition as mandated under the Act.

Approval of this application will result in increased competition leading to new services, lower prices, greater choices and more jobs.

I urge you to act without haste to ensure that the hometown team (Ameritech) be given the same opportunities as MCI, AT&T and the other long distance carriers.

Sincerely.

Doris J. Hodge, Ph.D. Business Manager

cc: Donald J. Russell

Telecommunications Task Force

• The Family Resource Place • 15100 Northline Rd., Suite 175 Southgate, MI 48195

Southgate, MI 48195 •(313) 282-7171 • TDD (313) 282-7184 • FAX (313) 282-7105

January 17, 1997

The Honorable Reed Hundt, Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street NW Washington DC 20544

Dear Chairman Hundt:

I am writing to express my support of competition in the telecommunications marketplace and of Ameritech's recent filing to provide in-region long-distance service in Michigan. True competition is the best friend of consumers and I urge your thoughful consideration of the Ameritech application.

With full competition in local and long distance services in Michigan, consumers can expect lower prices and more choice. Michigan residents will also benefit from the new jobs created as companies expand their products and services.

Sincerely.

Kay K/Iko

admin\corres\ameritch.kli

cc: Mr. Donald J. Russell

Telecommunications Task Force, Anti-Trust Division